



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ARBITRATION IN THE TACNA-ARICA DISPUTE

After more than two months of negotiations between delegates from Chile and Peru to the Tacna-Arica Conference, during which it often appeared that the ancient sore presented an insoluble problem, an agreement was formally reached on July 21 under which President Harding becomes arbitrator and the guiding force in the steps yet to be taken in future dealings between the two republics of the south over the territory.

Thus it appears that the principle of arbitration has been invoked with such success to pave the way to the end of a quarrel that for many years has constituted a grave danger to the peace of South America—now making rapid progress toward stability. Moreover, to those interested in friendship and understanding between the nations of the Western World, there is cause for extreme gratification that Chile and Peru have been able to find a helpful friend in the United States.

In outline, the work of President Harding will be as follows: (1) to decide whether there shall be a plebiscite in the disputed area; (2) to determine the conditions of the plebiscite, if one is held; (3) to send the issue to further conference of representatives of Chile and Peru, if there is no plebiscite; and (4) to use the good offices of the United States, should such a conference fail.

In the closing session of the conference, which was held in the Pan American Building, but lately the scene of the portentous negotiations of the Conference on the Limitation of Armament and Far Eastern Questions, Secretary Hughes, who had kept in close contact with the representatives of Chile and Peru, and was credited generally with having rendered great aid, made a speech in which he said, in part:

This is a day of extraordinary achievement and promise. When at the opening of the conference I ventured to express the firm conviction that your zealous and well-directed efforts would be successful, none of us had any illusion as to the difficulty of the task before you. The controversy was one of long standing, and deep-seated convictions with respect to its merits had been formed in each country. The patriotic sentiment to which we look for the motive power of national progress had been evoked among both peoples in support of what were believed to be their just contentions. It would be difficult to conceive of a situation more fraught with danger or one with less promise of amicable adjustment. The conviction that, despite these serious obstacles, an agreement would be reached at this conference was based on the noble purpose and conciliatory disposition which had been evinced by both governments in the arrangements for the conference and upon the earnest desire of the delegates to reach a sound basis of accord. We now witness the fruition of our hopes and the vindication of our confidence.

To you, Excellencies, members of the Chilean and Peruvian delegations, permit me to express not only my felicitations upon this happy result, but my deep appreciation of your able and earnest efforts which have made it possible. In your intimate contacts and candid and forcible representations of your respective positions, conscious of your weighty responsibility, you have maintained the best standards of diplomatic endeavor in a grave exigency. You may return to your respective countries with the gratifying assurance that you have most ably and faithfully discharged your onerous duties, and that this agreement represents no unreasonable sacrifice or disregard of any interest of your peoples, but a plan of settlement fair to both and which both have accepted with honorable regard for the interests of justice. You return with the assurance of the high esteem

in which you are held by all who have observed your conduct of this difficult negotiation.

It is difficult to overestimate the desirability of this agreement in the interest of the peoples of Chile and Peru. It points to a new era of peace and prosperity, in which friendship may be cultivated and mutual interest and opportunities for co-operation will be safeguarded. But the advantage to the peoples of Chile and Peru, inestimable as it is, forms but a part of the benefits which will accrue from this conference.

I believe this to be the dawn of a new day in Latin America. This long-standing controversy has been a sore spot and this amicable adjustment is the healing which gives promise of the development of better relations throughout Latin America and of the promotion of the growth of sound opinion. It is a vindication of the processes of peace. It is easy to talk of the prevention of war, but inevitably there will be differences, and serious controversies, and if these are not to be settled by force, there must be peaceful solutions, which can be had only through the efforts of governments which determinedly seek peace and make it possible by providing for the contacts of honorable and reasonable men whose ability, ingenuity, and wisdom will be utilized not to devise grounds for continuing differences, but practical bases of agreement.

The Chilean Ambassador, Señor Don Beltran Mathieu, voiced much the same thought in his closing address, part of which follows:

I am certain that among the principals and witnesses assembled in this building to participate at this happy ceremony there is one dominating thought, namely, that Pan Americanism is no vain and empty word.

The concept of Pan Americanism announced by Bolivar and formulated by Monroe is today being given practical realization by President Harding. He is making it a reality, in harmony with the spirit of this free people, who, while deeply appreciating and enjoying their own liberty and independence, is fully capable, at the same time, of appreciating and respecting the rights and independence of other nations.

The conference now brought to a close marks a distinct epoch in the development of Pan Americanism, offering a great example and pointing the direction to future progress.

The Chilean-Peruvian Conference at Washington was held in the most favorable surroundings, enjoying ample official and social hospitality. Its work was carried on with the utmost freedom, far removed from outside pressure of any kind whatsoever.

When, in the midst of the natural and inevitable difficulties which arise in negotiations of this character, it was necessary to ask for advice, such counsel—wise, discreet, and opportune—was cheerfully given by the Secretary of State of the United States, the Hon. Charles E. Hughes, whose personality in the sphere of international relations has become the symbol of peace and good-will.

On behalf of Peru, Dr. Meliton F. Porras delivered a closing speech, in which appeared thoughts at one with those of the Secretary of State and the Chilean Ambassador. Dr. Porras said:

This is both a solemn and happy moment, because the first decisive step toward peace and harmony in South America, where, for many years both were uncertain or weakened in a considerable portion of the continent, has at last been taken. The Peruvian delegation declares that it feels honored and satisfied to have contributed its share to this auspicious issue and to have interpreted, in furthering this end, the ardent desire of its country.

But it is not we, or our distinguished colleagues representing Chile, who are the chief authors of this wholesome and beneficent achievement. The real author, as has already been given to understand, is that dominant desire which is to be found in the minds of the men who direct the destinies of this great Republic; it is that love of peace and of justice which has thus prompted them to institute this diplomatic meeting; to foster its development within the peaceful sur-

roundings in which it has progressed, and to bring it to fruition with such positive advantage to the contending parties.

And why, we ask, should not this example be the beginning on this continent of that dreamed-of golden age of international justice, an ideal which so many famous statesmen have pursued during these last few years?

AN IDEA FROM AUSTRALIA

The ADVOCATE is in receipt of an interesting communication from Miss Eleanor M. Moore, secretary of the Victorian Council of the Australian Peace Alliance, which comprises a group of peace, labor, religious, and political organizations in the far-away new commonwealth. With the courage and faith of a pioneer people, the Australians propose to reach a warless world by the route of complete disarmament of the nations, and they propose to reach complete disarmament by a world-wide system of referenda, believing the people of the civilized nations will give a demonstration of hatred of war that the statesmen of the world must heed.

The letter to the ADVOCATE, one of more than 1,000 sent to all parts of the world, follows:

In this letter we bring forward for your consideration a suggestion concerning this most vital matter and all that it involves for the welfare of mankind.

It is obvious that the peoples of the world pay the price of armaments and war in many ways, and that the price is a heavy one, even in time of "peace," when the next war is in preparation. We therefore suggest that the peoples should have an opportunity to state definitely whether they wish to retain this ancient system, and that the question should be put to them apart from any other political issue.

Let simultaneous referenda be held, after negotiations by international conference or otherwise, putting before the men and women of each State this or a similarly worded question:

Are you willing that this (republic, kingdom, duchy, dominion, commonwealth, federation, or as the case may be) of — should disarm completely, on condition that the other States specified below do the same?

Here would follow the names of the other States, with a memorandum to the effect that each of them was putting the same question before its people at the same time.

In the event of a universal reply in the affirmative, governments could at once abolish all preparations for war. Should there be any negative answers, friendly persuasion could be brought to bear on the peoples so voting, with the object of inducing them to fall into line with the rest of the world.

Certain objections must be considered:

The Cost of Such Referenda.—If each State paid for its own referendum, the cost would be fairly distributed, while, if the result were complete disarmament, the cost would very quickly be saved.

Peoples Undeveloped Politically and Turbulent Border Tribes.—If a people were not sufficiently developed to understand a referendum, they would not be likely to be a serious menace; it might be necessary for a time to have some kind of local police, under international control, to keep order.

We believe that the suggestion made in this letter is sound in principle and should be adopted at the earliest possible moment, in the hope of thus ending the awful scourge of the war system by a decisive act on the part of the peoples of the world. It may be impossible for a time, but, if it be eventually adopted, much preliminary thought and discussion will be necessary and cannot begin too soon. We therefore bring it under your notice now, and if your consideration be favorable we would ask your advocacy of such referenda.

THE HUGHES-HOLT CORRESPONDENCE CLEARS THE AIR

The letters of Mr. Hamilton Holt, president of the Woodrow Wilson Democracy, to Secretary Hughes regarding the Permanent Court of International Justice and the relations of the United States to the League of Nations, and the Secretary's replies are much more important than the rather scant attention they received in the daily press would indicate.

Careful reading of Mr. Hughes' two letters will yield a very clear picture of the mind of the Administration when it decided to negotiate the Treaty of Berlin instead of resubmitting the Treaty of Versailles, as President Harding at first evidently wished to do. It also will yield a picture of what is in the Administration's mind as to the problem of American participation in the work of the Permanent Court, and as to the need for recognition of the Senate's power and purposes.

Lack of space will not permit printing the complete correspondence. Moreover, the correspondence is not important because of its controversial features, but because of the revelation, in Mr. Hughes' clear and lucid style, of what is in the Administration mind. Therefore only the letters of Mr. Hughes are given below. The general tenor of Mr. Holt's letters will appear, of course, from Mr. Hughes' replies.

The first Hughes letter, dated July 13 and replying to Mr. Holt's letter of July 7, follows:

MY DEAR MR. HOLT:

I have received your letter of July 7th.

You are good enough to refer to my speech at the Union League Club of New York in March, 1919, reviewing the preliminary draft of the Covenant of the League of Nations. The question as to the extent to which my suggestions were met was quite fully discussed in the campaign of 1920, and I then stated my views, as to the deficiencies of the revised draft, in public speeches which were fully reported. I see no useful purpose in going over that matter at this time, and I may simply point out that I did not regard any of my suggestions as adequately met in the revision of the Covenant save the first, as to the requirement of unanimity in decision.

As to the other matters you bring up, permit me to say:

In connection with Colonel Harvey's statement as to the commissions or committees appointed by the League, permit me to call your attention to the action of the Senate in assenting to the Treaty with Germany, providing that the United States "shall not be represented or participate in any body, agency, or commission," unless Congress "shall provide for such representation or participation."

COMMUNICATION FROM THE LEAGUE

There has been much fruitless talk about answering communications from the League. It may be pointed out that a large number of these are of a purely formal nature, for the purpose of giving information. I have endeavored to deal with all communications courteously and appropriately, and reports to the contrary are evidently based on inadequate information. Of course, whatever your wishes may be, the fact is that the United States is not a member of the League and I have no authority to act as if it were.

We have had appropriate representation at health conferences. I am advised of the work of the International Office of Public Health in Paris, and I do not believe that the interests of international health have been injured by the fact that that office has remained intact.